

**To:** Johnson, Kathleen[Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Miller, Amy[Miller.Amy@epa.gov]  
**From:** Meer, Daniel  
**Sent:** Thur 3/13/2014 4:29:46 PM  
**Subject:** Re: one more change!

This revision looks fine.

CA uses a cleanup level of 80 ppm lead, which is the cleanup level that we use for NPL sites. For time critical removal sites, we use 400 ppm at residential sites; this level can change depending on background and is used nationally by the removal program.

Most of the yards at Exide were in the 100 to 250 ppm range. Maybe 2 yards were over 400 ppm.

---

**From:** Johnson, Kathleen  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 9:13:32 AM  
**To:** Maier, Brent  
**Cc:** Miller, Amy; Moyer, Robert; Reyes, Deldi; McDaniel, Doug; Jones, Joel E.; Meer, Daniel  
**Subject:** one more change!

I got a call from Brian Johnson at DTSC this morning. He had heard we were working on a fact sheet on Exide. I ran the language by him. Based on that call, I would recommend we substitute the following bullet in the EJ enf fact sheet. Thanks Brent!

●■■■■■■■■ This month, DTSC released sampling results from 39 homes and two schools near the facility. Sampling revealed lead levels above conservative screening levels but below action levels. This data prompted DTSC to direct Exide to draft a plan to protect children and pregnant women living in affected homes. DTSC is also requiring additional testing.

Note to all, I understand that the DTSC screening level is 80 and EPA's action level is 400. Not sure exactly the levels found, but understand thru Dan that they are well below the level EPA would take emergency response.

Kathleen H. Johnson

Director, Enforcement Division

U.S. EPA - Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street ENF-1

San Francisco, CA 94015

415/972-3873

[johnson.kathleen@epa.gov](mailto:johnson.kathleen@epa.gov)